

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed 28 October 2008 included the following objections and rejections:

Claims 1 and 5-6 were objected to under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for informalities; and

Claims 1-7 and 11-19 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over United States Patent 6,542,610 to Traw et al. (Traw).

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims in order to further distinguish the claims over the cited reference. Applicants have also added new claims 20-28. Applicants further amend the claims in response to the request for antecedent basis.

I. Objection to the Claims for Informalities under Section 112, second paragraph.

Within the Office Action, the Examiner respectfully requested antecedent basis for "said storage" (claim 1, line 7);

"said instruction" (claim 1, line 16);

"said executing device" (claim 5, line 9); and

"said executing device (claim 6, line 4)."

Applicants amend the claims to recite a storage to provide antecedent basis for said storage, to recite a first set of instructions for said first set of instructions, and a device for said device. Moreover, the first set of instructions are further distinguished from the additional executable instructions.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims include antecedent bases. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims, including claims 1, 5 and 6, under section 112, second paragraph.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4 under Section 102(e).

Claims 1-4 were rejected under section 102(e) as being anticipated by Traw. Claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for regulating access to a storage contained in an audiovisual player device that is configured for executing instructions in a Turing-complete interpreter. The audiovisual player device is further configured to render content for playback. The method receives a request from a first set of instructions being executed. The request specifies (i) a portion of the storage for which access is requested, and (ii) several additional executable instructions. The method applies a cryptographic hash function to the additional executable instructions to obtain a hash value. The method authenticates the hash value.

Provided that the authentication is successful, the method enables access by the first set of instructions, to the requested portion of the storage while executing the additional executable instructions. If the authentication is not successful, the method inhibits at least one of (i) the rendering of the content, and (ii) execution of at least one feature associated with the content.

Applicants respectfully submit that Traw does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. The Traw Patent relates to a method of authentication between "computationally constrained devices." Hence, Traw is concerned with establishing protected channels for the transfer of content between devices. Traw does not disclose, teach, or even suggest receiving a request from a first set of instructions that specifies a first portion of the storage that is for

enabling rendering of the content by the device. Moreover, claim 1 recites inhibiting at least one of (i) the rendering of the content, and (ii) execution of at least one feature associated with the content.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Traw do not anticipate claim 1. Since claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1, Traw does not anticipate these claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(e) rejection of claims 1-4.

#### New Claims 20-25

Applicants add new claims 20-25. New claims 20-25 are dependent on claim 1. Applicants respectfully request examination and allowance of these new claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1.

#### III. Rejection of Claims 5-7 and 12-19 under Section 102(e)

Claims 5-7 and 12-19 were rejected under section 102(e) as being anticipated by Traw. Claims 6-7 and 12-19 are dependent on claim 5.

Claim 5 recites a disc medium containing encrypted audiovisual content for playback on any of several device architectures. The disc medium has program logic configured to identify at least one characteristic of a device executing the program logic. The program uses the at least one characteristic to determine which, if any, of several security weaknesses are present in the device. When the determination indicates a suspected weakness, the program selects at least one of several software countermeasures. The selected countermeasure corresponds to the suspected weakness and is compatible with the device. The program mitigates the suspected weakness by

directing the device to invoke the selected countermeasure, and decode the encrypted audiovisual content. The decoding includes a result produced by successful operation of the countermeasure logic. When the determination does not indicate a suspected weakness, the program decodes the audiovisual content by using at least one decryption key derived by using at least one cryptographic key associated with the device.

Applicants respectfully submit that Traw does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a disc medium. The Traw Patent relates to authentication between "computationally constrained devices." Hence, Traw is concerned with establishing protected channels for the transfer of content between devices. The cited portions of Traw do not disclose, teach, or even suggest determining which of a plurality of security weaknesses are present in the device, and selecting at least one countermeasure, as recited by claim 5. Moreover, claim 5 recites mitigating a suspected weakness by directing the device to invoke the selected countermeasure.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Traw do not anticipate claim 5. Since claims 6-7 and 12-19 are dependent on claim 5, Traw does not anticipate these claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 5. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(e) rejection of claims 5-7 and 12-19.

#### IV. Rejection of Claim 11 under Section 102(e)

Claim 11 was rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by Traw. Claim 11 recites an automated method for determining whether to allow a portion of software to access a portion of a memory in an audiovisual player device. The method receives a reference to the portion of software, computes a cryptographic hash of the software portion, and compares the computed

cryptographic hash with a value stored in the memory. When the computed cryptographic hash matches the stored value, the method allows the software portion to access the portion of the memory, and permits execution of at least one feature associated with the content. When the computed cryptographic hash does not match said stored value, (i) not allowing the software portion to access said nonvolatile memory and, (ii) inhibiting at least one of the rendering of the content, and execution of at least one feature associated with the content.

Applicants respectfully submit that Traw does not disclose, teach, or even suggest such a method. The Traw Patent relates to a method of authentication between "computationally constrained devices." Accordingly, Traw is concerned with establishing protected channels for the transfer of content between devices. By contrast claim 11 recites inhibiting at least one of (i) the rendering of the content, and (ii) execution of at least one feature associated with the content.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Traw do not anticipate claim 11. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(e) rejection of claim 11.

#### New Claims 26-29

Applicants add new claims 26-29. New claims 26-29 are dependent on claim 11. Applicants respectfully request examination and allowance of these new claims for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 11.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance, and early allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below so that issues may be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

MACROVISION SOLUTIONS CORPORATION

Dated: January 13, 2009

/Andy Pho/

Andy T. Pho  
Reg. No. 48,862

Macrovision Solutions Corporation  
2830 De La Cruz Boulevard  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Phone: (408) 562-8496  
Fax: (408) 562-1800